

2425 199<sup>th</sup> Avenue Court East  
Lake Tapps, WA, 98391  
December 4, 2006

Mr. Tom Loranger  
Program Manager  
State of Washington Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47775  
Olympia, WA, 98504-7775

**Re: Lake Tapps Draft Report of Examination for Water Right, Application No. S2-29934.**

Dear Mr. Loranger;

I, as a member of the Lake Tapps Community Council, have reviewed the draft ROE that Ecology provided in late September and have contributed comments on issues of flow and lake level, etc. thru the Lake Tapps Task Force and via The Lake Tapps Community Council's attorney. This letter is to express an additional "concern" about the draft document that is my own. My concern has to do with the textual treatment of the fishery issue that is heart and soul of the issues surrounding the division of available water flows in the White River. I believe a more complete or more even-handed discussion of the fishery is warranted.

For example:

I find only one very incidental mention to the existence of a substantial take of the salmon run whose habitat is being protected by provisions of the ROE. That Anecdotal comment at Page 73, line 2288-2291, refers to anglers 'inundating the few available bars in the lower Puyallup River'. I believe that the subject of fish caught in the lower river, whether by net or by hook should be dealt with in the text. I'm not advocating that the WSP limit or otherwise change the take, only that it be acknowledged and perhaps even quantified.

The histogram, Figure 32, on page 69 shows Chinook counts at the Mud Mountain Corps of Engineers fish trap only thru 2001. At that time the count was 2002 Chinook. This year thru September the count is 5481 Chinook Salmon trapped.

Note that Figure 32, referenced above shows that the returns were high well into the 1940's when Mud Mountain Dam was built, despite low White River MIF flows.

Similarly, the Figure 32 could show the significant increases that followed installation of the new fish screen and revision to the discharge system at Mud

Mountain Dam in the late 1990's. Perhaps the dates of those changes should be noted.

These examples, I believe, make the point that there is room to be a lot more 'complete' in discussion of the fish runs, their decimation, and recovery. Wouldn't it be nice to see a 'target' by which the public could judge progress toward restoration of the run. So far as I can determine only one "interim target" has been published in the late 1990's. It called for a return of 1000 Chinook in the White River!

Thanks for all your good work in preparation of the ROE and for your patience in answering the many, many questions that we posed to you and Aspect Consulting during the review period.

Sincerely,

Ralph L. Mason

LTCC  
Liz Thomas  
Shawn Bunney